

**Deposition Designations for:
JOHN PARKER
June 9, 2009**

Deposition Designation Key

**Arrowood = Arrowood Indem. Co.
f/k/a Royal Indem. Co. (Light Green)**

BNSF = BNSF Railway Co. (Pink)

**Certain Plan Objectors “CPO” = Government Employees Insurance Co.; Republic Insurance Co.
n/k/a Starr Indemnity and Liability Co.; OneBeacon America Insurance Co.; Seaton Insurance
Co.; Fireman’s Fund Insurance Co.; Allianz S.p.A. f/k/a Riunione Adriatica Di Sicurta; and Allianz
SE f/k/a Allianz Aktiengesellschaft; Maryland Casualty Co.; Zurich Insurance Co.; and Zurich
International (Bermuda) Ltd.; Continental Casualty Co. and Continental Insurance Co. and
related subsidiaries and affiliates; Federal Insurance Co.; and AXA Belgium as successor to Royal
Belge SA (Orange)**

CNA = Continental Cas. Co & Continental Ins. Co. (Red)

**FFIC = Fireman Funds Ins. Co. (Green)
FFIC SC = Fireman Funds Ins. Co. “Surety Claims” (Green)**

GR = Government Employees Ins. Co.; Republic Ins. Co. n/k/a Starr Indemnity and Liability Co.

Libby = Libby Claimants (Black)

OBS = OneBeacon America Ins. Co. and Seaton Ins. Co. (Brown)

PP = Plan Proponents (Blue)

Montana = State of Montana (Magenta)

Travelers = Travelers Cas. and Surety Cos. (Purple)

UCC & BLG = Unsecured Creditors’ Committee & Bank Lenders Group (Lavender)

**AFNE = Assume Fact Not in
Evidence
AO = Attorney Objection
BE = Best Evidence
Cum. = Cumulative
Ctr = Counter Designation
Ctr-Ctr = Counter-Counter
ET = Expert Testimony
F = Foundation
408 = Violation of FRE 408
H = Hearsay
IH - Incomplete Hypothetical**

**L = Leading
LA = Legal Argument
LC = Legal Conclusion
LPK - Lacks Personal Knowledge
LO = Seeking Legal Opinion
NT = Not Testimony
Obj: = Objection
R = Relevance
S = Speculative
UP = Unfairly Prejudicial under Rule 403
V = Vague**

IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

In re: Chapter 11
W.R. GRACE & CO., et al., Case No. 01-01139 (JKF)
Debtors. Jointly Administered
Ref. No. 21544

DEPOSITION OF JOHN PARKER, M.D.,
a witness herein, called for examination by the
Claimants, taken pursuant to the Federal Rules of
Bankruptcy Procedure, by and before Susan E. Alldridge,
a Registered Professional Reporter and Notary Public in
and for the State of West Virginia, at the Ramada Inn
Conference Center, 20 Scott Avenue, Morgantown,
West Virginia on Tuesday, 9 June 2009, at 9:09 a.m.

Dr. Parker - by Mr. Heberling

Page 114

1 winchite-asbestos and what kind of asbestos disease
2 it causes?

3 A. There's a tremendous body of epidemiologic
4 evidence about the human health effects of the
5 Libby amphibole contained in work by Harlan Amandus
6 and Corbett McDonald and a follow-up by a
7 Dr. Sullivan. So there's a great deal of
8 substantiation of the human health effects, perhaps
9 more than many other cohorts in the world that have
10 been studied.

11 Q. In this phrase "and progresses very
12 rapidly," what did you mean by that?

13 A. Again, in Dr. Whitehouse's March 2009
14 deposition, he seems very concerned that people's
15 lung function testing may change very dramatically
16 over a short period of time.

17 Q. Okay. So in this sentence that we've
18 focused on, beginning in the third line of page 10,
19 did you mean to say "and may progress very
20 rapidly"?

21 A. That would be okay.

22 Q. As you've written it, do you see that it
23 would be understood as generally progresses very
24 rapidly or just progresses very rapidly, period?

Page 115

1 A. I believe the antecedent sentence that
2 it's referring to is a statement that "Asbestos
3 disease due to Libby asbestos exposure is first
4 diagnosable. Usually there are no symptoms, only
5 positive findings on a chest x-ray or CT. The
6 disease may take decades to progress to a point of
7 severity." And that is a very typical textbook
8 description of asbestos-related disease.

9 But he's expressed views in his 2009
10 deposition that it progresses very rapidly,
11 although I would certainly allow the qualifier "may
12 progress very rapidly."

13 Q. Is it your understanding from the
14 March 2009 Whitehouse deposition that he's saying
15 it progresses very rapidly in all cases?

16 A. No.

17 Q. So "may progress very rapidly" would be
18 more correct? PP

19 A. That would be fine. Ctr.

20 Q. And then the next sentence, you say,
21 "Libby cohorts have asbestos-related disease quite
22 typical of amphibole-exposed cohorts."

23 Do you see that?

24 A. Yes.

Page 116

1 Q. What did you mean by "Libby cohorts,"
2 pleural?

3 A. The occupationally exposed cohorts that
4 have been studied by Amandus and McDonald and
5 Sullivan and the community cohorts that have been
6 studied by the American -- the Agency for Toxic
7 Substances and Disease Registry have asbestos
8 disease that's quite typical of amphibole-exposed
9 cohorts.

10 Q. In what way?

11 A. They have more pleural disease than
12 parenchymal disease, and they have pleural disease
13 that is frequently calcified. Those are the main
14 ways in which those cohorts are similar.

15 Q. Is it also typical in the sense that
16 there's predominantly visceral pleural thickening
17 with significant extent and thickness to it?

18 A. The presence of pleural disease in excess
19 of the parenchymal disease is different with
20 amphiboles than most Chrysotile-exposed
21 populations, and that seems to be the case in
22 Libby.

23 Q. And did you see a predominance in the
24 pleural thickening -- of visceral pleural

Page 117

1 thickening over pleural plaques?

2 A. No. Pleural plaques far exceed the
3 presence of diffuse pleural thickening in x-rays
4 that I've seen from Libby, including an enriched
5 film set that I saw in February and April of this
6 year.

7 Q. What does "enriched" mean?

8 A. There were a set of films selected by
9 Brad Black, to show extensive pleural disease, that
10 were given to the ATSDR, for those people to have
11 CT scans within the last two years and then have a
12 comparison of digitally acquired chest x-rays and
13 analog-acquired traditional chest x-rays to be
14 compared by six readers in the ATSDR study and then
15 compared also with the CT scans.

16 Q. How many --

17 A. And that cohort had much more parietal
18 pleural plaques than diffuse pleural thickening.

19 Q. How many --

20 A. And the same was true of the nearly 7,000
21 films I looked at from the Libby community and
22 occupational study reported by Peipins.

23 Q. How many films were in the enriched
24 series?

Dr. Parker - by Mr. Heberling

<p style="text-align: right;">Page 118</p> <p>1 A. 200. And we looked at those films as an 2 analog study, as a digital study, and as a CT 3 study. And we looked at them twice in each format. 4 Q. Does "analog" mean hard copy? 5 A. Analog means film screen acquired, a 6 traditional x-ray, as opposed to a digitally 7 acquired x-ray, which is a different technology. 8 The digital we looked at on a computer screen, and 9 the analog were looked at as a hard copy. 10 Q. On a light box? 11 A. On a light box, a view box, yes. 12 Q. Okay. Is there a paper written on this 13 project? 14 A. Not yet, no. 15 Q. There isn't even a draft, I take it? 16 A. I don't believe so. 17 Q. So in the predominance of pleural disease 18 over interstitial fibrosis, you say that's typical 19 of amphibole-exposed cohorts? 20 A. Yes. 21 Q. What amphibole-exposed cohorts have you 22 looked at? 23 A. Cohorts from South Africa, cohorts from 24 Australia, cohorts from the Eastern seaboard of the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 120</p> <p>1 Q. Is there a paper from that one? 2 A. No. There's a paper on tuberculosis from 3 that but not on the amphiboles. 4 Q. You mentioned from the East Coast. Was 5 that an amosite cohort? 6 A. Primarily, yes. 7 Q. Is that the Paterson, New Jersey, plant? 8 A. Those were films that Dr. Irving Selikoff 9 produced for me and others to look at. Dr. Ruth 10 Lilis produced for my review. And Dr. Al Miller 11 produced for my review. 12 Q. And these were predominantly amosite -- 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. -- exposures? 15 A. Yes. 16 Q. Did a paper get written out of that one? 17 A. Well, they've written many papers about 18 it, but I did not participate in a reading trial 19 that generated papers. It was a training exercise. 20 Q. And the Finland was what kind of asbestos? 21 A. That's mostly anthophyllite. And 22 Anders Zitting was the person I collaborated with 23 primarily on that, and Matti Huuskonen. And they 24 have many papers on it, but there was no paper</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">Page 119</p> <p>1 United States, cohorts from Finland, and cohorts 2 from Libby, Montana. There may be more, but that's 3 what I recall at this time. 4 Q. And the Australian cohort, was that from 5 the area of the Wittenoom mine? 6 A. Some of the papers have come from the 7 Wittenoom mine, and the experiences reported by 8 Australians, yes. 9 Q. You mentioned papers. Have you actually 10 looked at films from that area as well? 11 A. Yes. 12 Q. Was that as part of a project? 13 A. Yes. 14 Q. What project? 15 A. It was a project that James Lee had put 16 together. 17 Q. Is there a paper published as a result of 18 that? 19 A. No. 20 Q. And then what was the South African 21 cohort? 22 A. Yes. Those were people that 23 Dr. Neil White included in a series of x-rays that 24 we were applying the ILO classification system to.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 121</p> <p>1 produced from the radiographs I reviewed with them. 2 Q. And the predominantly pleural disease over 3 interstitial fibrosis, that would be different from 4 Chrysotile in a significant way? 5 A. Chrysotile does not produce as much 6 pleural abnormality as parenchymal abnormality, in 7 my experience. 8 Q. Is it significantly less? 9 A. It's related to dose response 10 relationships affecting the pleura and the 11 parenchyma. 12 Q. I was wondering if it's significantly less 13 than amphibole -- 14 A. Yes. 15 Q. -- cohort. 16 A. Yes. 17 Q. Okay. And in your review of Libby chest 18 x-rays, did you see a lot of thin but extensive 19 visceral pleural thickening? 20 A. Most costophrenic angle blunting that was 21 present was also accompanied by parietal pleural 22 plaques. There also was some costophrenic angle 23 blunting that would meet the definition of B2 by 24 ILO. I suspect most of what I saw of costophrenic</p>

Dr. Parker - by Mr. Heberling

Page 122

Libby

1 angle blunting would meet the B2 ILO definition, at
 2 least unilaterally.
 3 Q. I was asking about thin but extensive --
 4 A. I did not --
 5 Q. -- visceral pleural thickening. Did you
 6 see a lot of that?
 7 A. I saw some costophrenic angle blunting
 8 that would not meet the ILO definition of B2 but
 9 would meet the ILO definition of B1.
 10 Q. And would that be significantly different
 11 than Chrysotile presentations?
 12 A. Yes, in my experience.
 13 Q. And in the Libby x-rays, did you see a
 14 lower incidence of blunting with visceral pleural
 15 thickening than you've seen elsewhere?
 16 A. No.
 17 Q. And in the Libby chest x-rays, did you see
 18 significant subpleural interstitial fibrosis?
 19 A. It's been present but not different than
 20 other cohorts.
 21 Q. Not different than other amphibole
 22 cohorts?
 23 A. Yes.
 24 Q. Would that be different from Chrysotile

Page 123

Libby

1 cohorts?
 2 A. Not always.
 3 Q. "Not always," did you say?
 4 A. Yes.
 5 Q. Generally, is it?
 6 A. Generally, yes.
 7 Q. And in the Libby chest x-rays, did you see
 8 more -- or did you see cases of pure pleural
 9 disease with no interstitial fibrosis?
 10 A. Yes.
 11 Q. And is that consistent with other
 12 amphibole cohorts?
 13 A. Yes.
 14 Q. And is that also significantly different
 15 from Chrysotile cohorts?
 16 A. Not always, no.
 17 Q. Generally so?
 18 A. Yes.
 19 Q. And when you compared CT scans to chest
 20 x-rays on the same people from Libby, did you note
 21 that the CT scans showed a lot more pleural
 22 disease?
 23 A. Yes. The CT scans did demonstrate more
 24 pleural disease than was appreciated on the chest

PP Obj:
R

Libby

Page 124

PP
Obj:
R

1 x-ray.
 2 Q. And is that consistent with amphibole
 3 cohorts?
 4 A. Yes. And Chrysotile cohorts.
 5 Q. And then you mentioned the amosite cohort
 6 from Paterson, New Jersey. Did you do any work on
 7 that same cohort after it moved to Tyler, Texas?
 8 A. No, I did not.
 9 Q. A lot of the same workers moved from
 10 New Jersey to Texas, didn't they?
 11 A. I'm not sure if it was the workers who
 12 moved. I guess it was the workers who moved. I
 13 was going to say also some of the investigators
 14 moved, too.
 15 Q. Any other amphibole cohorts in the
 16 United States that you've done work on?
 17 A. No, I don't believe so.
 18 Q. On page 10 of Exhibit 1, just above the
 19 new caption "The Importance Of," there's a sentence
 20 beginning "The Libby radiographic and clinical
 21 findings are consistent with international
 22 populations exposed to amphibole asbestos."
 23 And what are you referring to in terms of
 24 clinical findings there?

Page 125

Libby

1 A. Could you redirect me? I actually didn't
 2 see where it was.
 3 Above the bold.
 4 Q. Yes.
 5 A. Yes. I meant that populations exposed to
 6 amphiboles in Finland and Turkey and Australia and
 7 South Africa and other locations have had
 8 radiographic findings with extensive pleural
 9 abnormalities sometimes reported. And clinical
 10 findings of effusions, clinical findings of rounded
 11 atelectasis, clinical findings of parietal plaques,
 12 clinical findings of lung cancer, clinical findings
 13 of diffuse pleural thickening have been identified
 14 in other international populations that are
 15 amphibole exposed. And the Libby's findings were
 16 quite typical of those that have been seen and
 17 reported internationally.
 18 Q. Okay. So as to effusions, the Libby
 19 findings are consistent with amphiboles?
 20 A. Yes.
 21 Q. And would you say the incidence of
 22 effusions in Libby is significantly greater than in
 23 Chrysotile cohorts?
 24 A. Yes. I haven't seen a lot of films myself

PP Obj:
R

Dr. Parker - by Mr. Heberling

Libby

PP Obj: Page 126
R

1 with effusions from Libby, but the experience
2 reported would make me think that it's more than
3 with Chrysotile, yes.

4 Q. And as to rounded atelectasis, were the
5 Libby films consistent with other amphibole cohort
6 films?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And significantly greater than Chrysotile
9 cohorts?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. And as to the incidence of diffuse pleural
12 thickening, was Libby consistent with amphibole
13 cohorts on that issue?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And significantly greater than Chrysotile
16 cohorts?

17 A. Possibly.

18 Q. Did you say "possibly"?

19 A. Possibly.

20 Q. You're not sure?

21 A. I'm not certain.

22 Q. And what about the finding of chest pain?

23 Was -- were the Libby clinical findings in that

24 regard consistent with amphibole cohorts elsewhere?

PP Obj:
R; F

Page 128

1 even a preliminary ATSDR report that showed not
2 very much restrictive and not very much obstructive
3 disease in the cohort. But I don't believe that's
4 in the peer review literature.

5 Q. Are these documents public?

6 A. If Bibi Gottschall's was an abstract at
7 ATS, American Thoracic Society, meaning it would
8 certainly be public.

9 MR. STANSBURY: Jon, just so you
10 know, in the final report to the community, it's in
11 there. The ATSDR's final report for the community,
12 that's where that reference to the PFT results was.
13 That's public.

14 BY MR. HEBERLING:

15 Q. And in the other amphibole cohorts, have
16 you found the phenomenon of isolated DLCO?

17 MR. STANSBURY: Object to form.

18 THE DEPONENT: And, of course, you're
19 referring to a reduction in DLCO out of proportion
20 to the reduction in FVC?

21 BY MR. HEBERLING:

22 Q. I'm referring to DLCO as being the only
23 number that is significantly reduced.

24 A. The only number that's below 80 percent

Page 127

1 A. I don't know -- I don't have any good
2 information on the symptoms of chest pain in the
3 Libby cohort.

4 Q. And how about the incidence of obstructive
5 disease? Was that consistent in Libby as with
6 amphibole cohorts of elsewhere?

7 A. I don't have any good information on that.
8 National Jewish did the lung function testing in
9 the largest of the Libby studies and reported in
10 abstract form only and found very little
11 restrictive or obstructive disease, either one.

12 Q. What set of chest x-rays were they looking
13 at?

14 A. The Bibi Gottschall and others from
15 National Jewish in Denver. They were looking at
16 spirometry on the 6- or 7,000 people surveyed by
17 ATSDR.

18 Q. And this is the survey of 6- or 7,000
19 people reported in Peipins?

20 A. Yes. That lung function data is not
21 reported in the Peipins paper.

22 Q. So you've seen some abstract?

23 A. Yes. I've seen abstract from the National
24 Jewish information on the Libby cohort and maybe

Page 129

1 predicted?

2 Q. Yes. The only number out of DLCO, FVC,
3 TLC.

4 A. That's not been drawn to my attention. It
5 certainly may have occurred, but I have not seen
6 it.

7 Q. And page 11 of your report, Exhibit 1,
8 about the fifth line down, it says, "The
9 distinction between asbestosis and pleural plaques
10 is important for prognostic implications to
11 patients including patient education and attendant
12 future health risks. When Dr. Whitehouse blends
13 these two disorders, rather than recognizing them
14 as distinct in prognosis and for patient health
15 education, he does his patients a major
16 disservice."

17 Do you see that?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Now, asbestosis can be a severe disease;
20 correct?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. And diffuse pleural thickening can be a
23 severe disease; correct?

24 A. Yes. My statement is about pleural